

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16-25, 27-32, 34-41, 56, 57, 59-61, and 67-69. Applicant canceled claims 1-15, 26, 33, 42-55, 58, and 62-66 in previous communications. By the present Response, Applicant amends claims 16, 28, 56, and 67-69 to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 16-25, 27-32, 34-41, 56, 57, 59-61, and 67-69 will remain pending in the present patent application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-referenced application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16-25, 27-32, 34-41, 56, 57, 59-61, and 67-69 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Particularly, the rejection appears to rely on the interim guidelines for examination provided by the Patent Office in November 2005. *See* Office Action mailed July 19, 2006, pages 2-3. This reliance is simply misplaced. Applicant respectfully submits that the interim guidelines noted by the Examiner fail to provide clear guidance, particularly with respect to identifying a “tangible result”; contain significant internal inconsistencies; and are not fully in accordance with relevant, binding legal precedent of the Federal Circuit. *See, e.g., State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.*, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc.*, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d 1447 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

However, in the interest of advancing prosecution of the instant patent application, Applicant is presently amending independent claims 16, 28, 56, and 67-69 to obviate the basis for the rejection. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected these claims for allegedly failing to produce any tangible results, and stated that “[f]or the result to be tangible, the estimated values of a plurality of electrical parameters would need to be outputted to a user or displayed to a user or stored for later use by a user.” *See* Office

Action mailed July 19, 2006, pages 2-3. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his suggestions, and has amended the independent claims along these lines to generally provide for outputting and/or storing the estimated values of the plurality of electrical parameters. In view of these amendments, Applicant believes the basis for the rejection of claims 16, 28, 56, 67-69, and their respective dependent claims, is now moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and allowance of claims 16-25, 27-32, 34-41, 56, 57, 59-61, and 67-69.

**Conclusion**

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 28, 2006



L. Lee Eubanks IV  
Reg. No. 58,785  
FLETCHER YODER  
P.O. Box 692289  
Houston, TX 77269-2289  
(281) 970-4545

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS**  
ALLEN-BRADLEY COMPANY, LLC  
Patent Department/704P Floor 8 T-29  
1201 South Second Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53204  
Attention: Mr. Alexander Gerasimow  
Phone: (414) 382-2000